

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.61667 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-12 Year-2018 Thana- JEHANABAD COMPLAINT CASE
District- Jehanabad

=====

Chandan Chaudhary S/o Karamu Chaudhary R/o Vill- Bala Bigha, P.S.-
Telhara, Distt- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Suresh Chaudhary S/o Late Jawahar Chaudhary R/o Vill- Narma, Post-
Barawan, P.S.- Pali, Distt- Jehanabad

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Paras Nath, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bishweshwar Ram, APP
For Opposite Party No. 2:	:	N o n e

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

3 19-11-2025 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Despite valid service of notice, nobody appears on
behalf of the complainant/Opposite Party No. 2.

3. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a complaint
case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323,
498A and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 3 and 4 of
the Dowry Prohibition Act.

4. The prosecution case, in brief, is that marriage of
daughter complainant was solemnized with this petitioner as per
Hindu rites and rituals on 15.02.2016. It is alleged that after
marriage, all the accused persons named in the complaint



petition, including this petitioner, subjected daughter of complainant to torture and harassment due to non-fulfillment of demand of dowry and subsequently, ousted her from her matrimonial house.

5. It is submitted on behalf of petitioner that petitioner is quite innocent and has committed no offence. Petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case merely because happens to be husband of daughter of complainant and present case has been lodged due to petty family dispute. There are general and omnibus allegations. As a matter of fact, the petitioner at no point of time demanded any dowry or committed torture. It is further submitted that petitioner is ready to keep the daughter of complainant, as his wife, with full honour and dignity. It is next submitted that the case is triable by the Magistrate. In this connection, learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon a judgment of this Court in the case of *Md. Naimul Haque Ansari @ Naimul Haque Ansari & Ors. Vs. The State of Bihar*, reported in **2006(3) PLJR 182**. Petitioner claims clean antecedents.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of petitioner.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the



case, general and omnibus nature of accusation and clean antecedents of the petitioner, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is allowed.

8. Accordingly, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender within a period of eight weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Jehanabad in connection with Complaint Case No. 12 of 2018, subject to condition as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S..

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

